

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Stanley Zhong, Nan Zhong, and
SWORD (Students Who Oppose Racial
Discrimination),

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No. 2:25-cv-10579
Hon. Gershwin A. Drain
Mag. Judge David R. Grand

The Regents of the University of Michigan,

Defendant.

Stanley Zhong
211 Hope St., #390755
Mountain View, CA 94039

Nan Zhong
211 Hope St., #390755
Mountain View, CA 94039
(425) 698-9139
nanzhong1@gmail.com

Brian M. Schwartz (P69018)
Sydney G. Rohlicek (P85655)
MILLER, CANFIELD, PADDOCK
AND STONE, P.L.C.
150 W. Jefferson Ave., Ste. 2500
Detroit, MI 48226
(313) 963-6420
Attorneys for Defendant
schwartzb@millercanfield.com
rohlicek@millercanfield.com

**DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR EMERGENCY CONSIDERATION OF ITS
MOTION FOR DEADLINE FOR PLAINTIFFS
TO FILE A FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Defendant, the Regents of the University of Michigan (the “University”), through its counsel, Miller, Canfield, Paddock and Stone, PLC, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 1 and the Court’s inherent power to control its own docket, moves for emergency (expedited) consideration of its Motion for Deadline for Plaintiffs to File

a First Amended Complaint (“Motion for Deadline”). In support of this Motion, the University states:

1. The deadline for the University to answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiffs’ Complaint is June 9, 2025. (ECF No. 8).

2. On May 30, 2025, the University filed its Motion for Deadline. That Motion seeks to have Plaintiffs file their First Amended Complaint before the University is forced to respond to Plaintiff’s current operative Complaint, which Plaintiffs already plan to amend.

3. Emergency (expedited) consideration is required because absent such relief, the deadline for the University to respond to the Complaint may pass before the conclusion of the briefing schedule set forth in Local Rule 7.1.

4. On May 29, 2025, pursuant to Local Rule 7.1(a), the University requested that Plaintiffs agree to a schedule that would avoid unnecessary motion practice and save resources. Plaintiffs responded that they would not agree to file their First Amended Complaint before seeing the University’s Motion to Dismiss. During a meet and confer via Microsoft Teams on May 30, Plaintiffs again confirmed they would not concur, necessitating the filing of this Motion.

Accordingly, the University requests that the Court:

- (a) stay the deadline for the University to respond to the Complaint pending the resolution of the University’s Motion for Deadline; and

- (b) grant emergency (expedited) consideration of the University's Motion for Deadline.

Dated: May 30, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Brian M. Schwartz

Brian M. Schwartz (P69018)
Sydney G. Rohlicek (P85655)
MILLER, CANFIELD, PADDOCK AND
STONE, P.L.C.

150 W. Jefferson Ave., Ste. 2500
Detroit, MI 48226
(313) 963-6420

Attorneys for Defendant

schwartzb@millercanfield.com

rohlicek@millercanfield.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that May 30, 2025, I electronically filed the foregoing paper with the Clerk of the Court using the ECF/CM filing system which will send notification of such filing to the attorneys of record.

/s/Brian M. Schwartz

Brian M. Schwartz (P69018)